

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

A new title is required because the title is allegedly “not descriptive.”

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kimura et al (JP 09-045275) (hereinafter “Kimura”).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

No claim has been amended in the instant amendment paper. Accordingly, claim 1 remains currently pending for consideration. Applicants have also amended the title in response to the requirement in the Office Action.

Requirement for a New Title

A new title is required because the title is allegedly “not descriptive.” In response, Applicants have replaced the previous title with a new amended title. Accordingly, withdrawal of the requirement for a new title is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kimura. Applicants note that the applied Kimura reference is owned by Applicants’ company. As a result, the following remarks are prepared with a particular understanding of the disclosure of Kimura and how that disclosure differs from the claim of the instant application. As a result, the rejection in the Office Action is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Applicants respectfully submit that the pipe (200, 201) described in Kimura merely tightens up

and pierces dynode 500, anode 6, and insulator 41 together. The relay lead pin 7 equipped for a power supply mounts dynode 500, an anode 6, and insulator 41 inside housing 1. See Fig. 2 of Kimura. However, the column 9, as specifically described in the claim of the instant application, pierces dynode 500, anode 6, and insulator 41 and is directly mounted on stem 3. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that column 9, as described in the claim of the instant application, pierces and retains each component and mounts each retention component on the stem in a manner having a completely different structure than any structure disclosed in Kimura for at least the foregoing reasons. In the instant application's arrangement, Applicants respectfully submit that a rear edge of the column is mounted on the stem and an arresting member is attached to the top.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because Kimura does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 1 of the instant application. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)."

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claim is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claim. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response; the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: August 5, 2008

By:

Paul A. Fournier
Reg. No. 41,023

Customer No. 055694

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465